arXiv:1602.09009v1 [math.LO] 29 Feb 2016

EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS INVARIANT UNDER GROUP ACTIONS

TOMASZ RZEPECKI

Abstract. We study, in an abstract context, equivalence relations which are invariant under group actions. More precisely, we fix a transformation group, and we study the orbital equivalence relations (i.e. orbit equivalence relations of normal subgroups) and a wider class of weakly orbital equivalence relations. For these sorts of relations we show (under some additional assumptions) that if each class is well-behaved, then so is the class space and the relation as a whole (where well-behaved means type-definable or closed for the classes and the relation and Hausdorff for the class space). We apply these conclusions in model theory to generalise a recent result tying type-definability and smoothness of invariant equivalence relations. We also obtain analogous results for type-definable actions (in model theory), as well as continuous actions of compact groups, or, more generally, proper group actions.

1. Introduction

The study of equivalence relations induced by group actions – or, more precisely, of orbit spaces – has a long tradition in various disciplines of mathematics, for example in topology, Lie group theory, descriptive set theory, and algebraic geometry. Also in model theory, particular examples of such equivalence relations (in abstract first-order theories) have been an important object of study since at least the 1980s.

On the other hand, in many cases, when we have a (semi-)group acting on a set (which is frequently the group itself), various objects invariant under this action are very useful, like invariant metrics, invariant measures, invariant subspaces. In model theory, objects invariant under the action of the automorphism group of the monster model are fundamental.

The goal of this paper is to study equivalence relations which are invariant under a particular group action, but are finer than the orbit equivalence relation induced by the action – or, more precisely, some well-behaved classes of those which we call orbital and weakly orbital.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54H15; 03C45; 22C05; 03E15.

Key words and phrases. transformation groups, equivalence relations, compact groups, bounded invariant equivalence relations, Borel cardinality.

The author is supported by NCN grant 2015/17/N/ST1/02322.

We study them in a very abstract context at first, and then apply the ideas directly in more concrete examples of compact group actions, as well as, in model-theory, equivalence relations invariant under (type-)definable group actions or the actions of automorphism groups of monster models.

From those, we obtain a strengthening of a recent result about invariant equivalence relations (from [KPR15]), as well as some analogues for both compact group actions and type-definable group actions.

1.1. **Summary of results.** The context is that we have a group G acting on a space X in a somehow regular manner, which is related to a notion of a "pseudo-closed" set. A prototypical example is a continuous action of a compact Hausdorff group on a compact space (in which case "pseudo-closed" means just closed). This will be explained in more detail in Section 4.

An orbital equivalence relation is simply the orbit equivalence relation of a normal subgroup of G; weakly orbital equivalence relations will be defined and studied in depth in Section 3, along with more detailed discussion about the orbital equivalence relations.

Meta-theorem 1. *Suppose E is an orbital equivalence relation X. Then (under some extra assumptions) the following are equivalent:*

1. *E is pseudo-closed,*
2. *each E-class is pseudo-closed,*
3. *E is the orbit equivalence relation of a pseudo-closed subgroup of G.*

(For precise instances, see Theorems 4.4, 5.3, 6.3 and 7.5.)

Meta-theorem 2 is essentially a generalisation of Meta-theorem 1, however, the precise statements of its concrete variants are more technical.

Meta-theorem 2. *Suppose E is a weakly orbital equivalence relation. Then (under some extra assumptions) the following are equivalent:*

1. *E is pseudo-closed,*
2. *each E-class is pseudo-closed, and the way E changes between G-orbits is "controlled" by a pseudo-closed set $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$,*
3. *E may be defined in terms of a pseudo-closed subgroup $H \leq G$ and a pseudo-closed set $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$.*

(For precise instances, see Theorems 4.7, 5.7, 6.4 and 7.6.)

In general, when we have an equivalence relation with ill-behaved classes, we can also expect the class space to be ill-behaved itself. For example, if an equivalence relation on a topological space has some dense classes, the quotient has a non-Hausdorff topology. The converse is not always true: for example, there are known examples of equivalence relations which not only have closed classes, but are closed

themselves, whereas their class spaces are not Hausdorff. By contrast, in the cases we consider, we can apply instances of Meta-theorems 1 and 2 to conclude that various conditions turn out to be equivalent.

Meta-corollary. *Suppose E is an equivalence relation which is either orbital or weakly orbital. Then under some extra assumptions, we have an equivalence:*

(1) E is pseudo-closed,
(2) each E-class is pseudo-closed,
(3) the quotient space X/E is well-behaved,
(4) for each $x \in X$, the restriction $E\restriction_{G\cdot x}$ is pseudo-closed.

(For precise instances, see Corollaries 5.8, 6.5 and 7.7.)

1.2. **Motivation.** In model theory, the notion of an orbital equivalence relation was first introduced in [KR14] (as simply a relation whose classes are orbits of a fixed subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, the automorphism group of the monster model) in order to prove some results about equivalence relations invariant under automorphism groups about the connection between the descriptive-set-theoretic notion of smoothness and the model-theoretic notion of type-definability. The results of a later paper [KPR15] (namely, Facts 2.16 and 2.17), essentially superseded the ones from [KR14], without using orbitality anywhere.

The main theorems in both papers were essentially about $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$-invariant equivalence relations on sets of realisations of complete types (i.e. $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$-orbits).

However, around the time [KPR15] was being finalised, it was noted that a particular case of Meta-Theorem 1 (essentially, Theorem 7.5) seems to be true, which, in turn, may be used to derive a variant of Meta-corollary from the results of [KPR15]. The notion of weak orbitality is meant to provide a proper context for a version of Meta-corollary which would extend both the main results of [KPR15] and the aforementioned variant, by including relations invariant under transitive group actions as well as those which are simply orbital.

(For a more concrete exposition of the results from [KPR15] discussed here, as well as the wider context, see Subsection 2.3.)

It turns out that the results apply, in largely unchanged form, also outside of model theory, for example to compact group actions (see Lemma 5.2 and Corollary 5.8).

It is also possible that the connection between subgroups of a given group and invariant equivalence relations – particularly between normal subgroups and orbital equivalence relations – could be a useful tool in group theory. For example, due to Remarks 3.6 and 3.9, each orbital equivalence relation (on a given G-space) corresponds to a unique normal subgroup of G. In some more specific contexts, this can be extended to correspondence between e.g. closed normal subgroups and closed

orbital equivalence relations, which could be of interest in study of topological groups. (See e.g. Corollaries 3.11, 5.6, and Proposition 3.12.)

1.3. **Structure of the paper.** This paper is intentionally very modular, so that one may, for instance, skip entirely the parts related to weakly orbital equivalence relations and focus instead on the orbital case (which is less technical, but should still convey the general ideas). Similarly, one can ignore almost entirely the parts pertaining to compact group actions or model theory, without much of a harm to understanding the rest.

The preliminary Section 2 is divided into facts related to compact group actions, the ones from model theory, and recent results from model theory which we intend to improve upon (and use).

Section 3 introduces and explains the central notions of orbital and weakly orbital equivalence relations.

In Section 4, we formulate and prove precise, but still very abstract versions of the main theorems – as announced in Subsection 1.1 – which are then used in Sections 5, 6 and 7 to obtain the more concrete versions.

Sections 5 (about compact group actions), 6 (about type-definable group actions) and 7 (about automorphism group actions) have a generally parallel structure: first we prove some preparatory lemmas, and then we proceed to prove the results (according to the outline in Subsection 1.1) along with some additional corollaries.

Finally, in Section 8, we formulate some further questions to consider.

While Sections 6 and 7 do require a background in model theory, the rest of the paper should be accessible to the general mathematical audience.

2. Preliminaries and previous results

Those preliminaries are only required for Section 5 (Subsection 2.1) and Sections 6 and 7 (Subsection 2.2). They can be skipped and only referred to as needed later, especially if one is principally interested in applications in either compact group actions or model theory.

2.1. **Preliminaries for compact group actions.** For a comprehensive guide to compact group actions, one might consult [Bre72]. Here, we only list the few bare facts we will need later on.

Fact 2.1 ([Bre72, Theorems 1.2 and 3.1])**.** *Suppose G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X. Then:*

- *X/G is Hausdorff*
- *$G \times X \to X$ is a closed map (i.e. images of closed sets are closed).*
- *$X \to X/G$ is a closed map.*

There are several different notions of a "proper map". One that will be convenient for us is the one used in [Bou66].

Definition 2.2. A continuous map $f\colon X \to Y$ is said to be *proper* if for every Z, the map $f \times \mathrm{id}_Z\colon X \times Z \to Y \times Z$ is closed.

Fact 2.3 ([Bou66, Theorem 2 in §10.2 of Chapter I])**.** *Suppose $f\colon X \to Y$ is continuous. Then the following are equivalent:*

- *f is proper,*
- *f is closed and its fibres (preimages of points) are compact.*

An important fact in this context is that continuous actions of compact groups are proper.

Fact 2.4 ([Bou66, Proposition 2 in §4.1 of Chapter III])**.** *If G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X, then it is also acting properly, that is, the function $G \times X \to X \times X$, defined by the formula $(g, x) \mapsto (x, g \cdot x)$ is proper.*

We will also use the following fact, which is more descriptive-set-theoretic in nature.

Fact 2.5 ([Mil77, Theorem 1])**.** *Suppose that G is a totally nonmeager [=without any closed subsets meager in themselves] group, and $H \leq G$. If there is a countable family $(E_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ of strictly Baire [= whose trace on every subspace has the Baire property, relatively to the subspace topology] sets separating right cosets of H [= every right coset is exactly the intersection of those E_i which intersect it], then H is closed.*

For our applications, it is important that a compact group is always totally nonmeager (because every closed subset is compact) and Borel sets are always strictly Baire (because open and closed sets have the Baire property, which is preserved by countable operations). Note also that we can switch right cosets for left cosets in Fact 2.5 just by taking inverses.

To formulate some of the corollaries, we will need the classical notion of smoothness from descriptive set theory.

Definition 2.6. Suppose that E is an equivalence relation on a Polish space X. We say that E is *smooth* if there is a Borel function $f\colon X \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $x_1\ E\ x_2$ if and only if $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$.

Equivalently, E is smooth if it admits a countable Borel separating family, i.e. there is a family $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ of Borel sets such that $x_1\ E\ x_2$ if and only if for all n we have $x_1 \in B_n \iff x_2 \in B_n$.

Fact 2.7. *Every closed equivalence relation on a Polish space is smooth.*

Smoothness and the related notion of Borel cardinality will not be the main focus of this paper, so we will not discuss them at length, but the curious reader may consult [BK96] for more about group actions from the descriptive-set-theoretic perspective, including smoothness.

2.2. **Preliminaries in classical model theory.** Here we recall very briefly some basic facts and definitions which will be applied in the model-theoretical parts of this paper. This is not comprehensive, and is only meant to remind the most important notions; for more in-depth explanation, see e.g. [TZ12] for the elementary and [CLPZ01] for the more advanced topics.

Definition 2.8. Some basic definitions and conventions we will use are the following.

- We fix a complete first-order theory T with infinite models.
- By $\mathfrak{C}$ we will denote a monster model of T, i.e. a model which is κ-saturated and κ-strongly homogeneous for a sufficiently large (strong limit) cardinal κ (or simply a saturated model of cardinality κ, for a sufficiently large strongly inaccessible cardinal κ, if such κ exists).
- We say that something is *small* or *bounded* if it is smaller than the κ from the definition of the monster model.
- We say that a set is $A-$*type-definable* (or *type-definable over* A) if it is the intersection of a small number sets, each definable over A in a (fixed) small product of sorts of $\mathfrak{C}$. When A is irrelevant, we simply say that the set is type-definable.
- $\equiv$ is the relation of having the same type over $\emptyset$.
- We say that a set (a subset of a small product of sorts of $\mathfrak{C}$) is *invariant* if it is setwise invariant under the standard action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ or, equivalently, if it is $\equiv$-invariant. When A is a small set, we say that a set is *invariant over* A if it is invariant under the group of automorphisms which fix A pointwise.

Definition 2.9. Here we list the most relevant definitions related to equivalence relations and connected components in model theory:

- We say that an equivalence relation is *bounded* if it has a small number of classes.
- On every product of sorts of $\mathfrak{C}$, we have $\equiv_{KP}$ and $\equiv_L$ (*Kim-Pillay* and *Lascar equivalence*), which are the finest bounded and, respectively, $\emptyset$-type-definable and invariant equivalence relations. Their classes are called *Kim-Pillay* and *Lascar strong types* (respectively).
- If G is a type-definable group (i.e. G is type-definable and the graph of its group operation is type-definable) while A is a small set, then we have the *connected components* G^{00}_A and G^{000}_A, which are the smallest A-type-definable and invariant over A (respectively) subgroups of small index in G.
- If E is a bounded invariant (over a small set) equivalence relation on an invariant set X, then we have the so-called *logic topology* on X/E, where the closed sets are precisely those

which have type-definable preimages under the quotient map $X \to X/E$.

- There are groups $\mathrm{Aut\,f}_{KP}(\mathfrak{C})$ and $\mathrm{Aut\,f}_{L}(\mathfrak{C})$ called (resp.) *Kim-Pillay* and *Lascar strong automorphism groups*. They are normal subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $\equiv_{KP}$- and $\equiv_L$-classes are exactly the orbits of the appropriate strong automorphism groups.
- The quotient $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})/\mathrm{Aut\,f}_{L}(\mathfrak{C})$ is called the *Galois group* of the theory T and denoted by $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$. It does not depend on the choice of the monster model.

Fact 2.10. *Some basic facts and observations:*

(1) A type-definable and $\equiv_L$-invariant set is $\equiv_{KP}$-invariant. (see e.g. [KPR15, Corollary 1.13])

(2) If $M \preceq \mathfrak{C}$ is any submodel, then having the same type over M implies having the same Lascar strong type (i.e. being $\equiv_L$-equivalent).

(3) If m is a tuple (infinite) enumerating a small submodel $M \preceq \mathfrak{C}$, then the map $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \to [m]_{\equiv}/{\equiv_L}$ defined by $\sigma \mapsto [\sigma(m)]_{\equiv_L}$ factors through $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$, and in fact the induced map $\mathrm{Gal}(T) \to [m]_{\equiv}/{\equiv_L}$ is a bijection. By identifying (via this map) $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ with $[m]_{\equiv}/{\equiv_L}$, we obtain the logic topology on $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$, which it does not depend on the choice of m.

(4) $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ is a (possibly non-Hausdorff) compact topological group when endowed with the logic topology.

(5) The closure of the identity in $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ is $\mathrm{Aut\,f}_{KP}(\mathfrak{C})/\mathrm{Aut\,f}_{L}(\mathfrak{C})$. It is sometimes denoted by $\mathrm{Gal}_0(T)$.

(6) If X is a type-definable set and E is a bounded invariant equivalence relation on X, then X/E is a Hausdorff space (with the logic topology) if and only if E is type-definable.

With regard to (6), the fact that type-definable relations have Hausdorff quotients is folklore, while the converse is easy to see, as E is the preimage of the diagonal of X/E, which – provided X/E is Hausdorff – is a closed subset of $(X/E)^2$ (in the product of logic topologies on X/E, and hence in the – a priori stronger – logic topology on $X^2/(E \times E)$).

2.3. **Previous results in model theory.** In the recent years, there has been some success in applying some notions of descriptive set theory to the study of bounded invariant equivalence relations. For further explanations, one may consult one or more of [KPS13], [KR14], [KMS14], [KM14], or [KPR15], particularly the preliminary sections.

Let us first define what smoothness means in the model-theoretic context.

Definition 2.11. If X is an invariant set, then we say that it is *countably supported* if it is a subset of a countable product of sorts of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Definition 2.12. Suppose that the theory is countable. Let M be a countable model, and let E be a countably supported, bounded equivalence relation, invariant over M, on an M-type-definable set X. Denote by X_M the space of types over M of elements of X.

Then X_M is a compact Polish space and we have an equivalence relation E^M on X_M, the pushforward of E via $x \mapsto \operatorname{tp}(x/M)$ (i.e. $\operatorname{tp}(x_1/M)\ E^M\ \operatorname{tp}(x_2/M)$ if and only if $x_1\ E\ x_2$). (This is well-defined essentially by Fact 2.10 (2).)

Definition 2.13. We say that E is *smooth* if E^M is smooth, as per Definition 2.6 (this does not depend on the choice of the countable model M).

Fact 2.14. *As an immediate corollary of Fact 2.7, in a countable theory, a type-definable, countably supported, bounded equivalence relation is smooth.*

The idea to use descriptive set theory in this context originated in [CLPZ01], was refined in [KPS13], and finally, the authors of [KMS14] succeeded at showing that the converse of Fact 2.14 holds for $\equiv_L$ (i.e. that if $\equiv_L$ is smooth, then it must be type-definable), which was previously conjectured in [KPS13]. This result was generalised independently in [KR14] and [KM14] to a wider class of relations (the two generalisations being largely equivalent). Of the two, [KR14] introduced the notion of an orbital equivalence relation, as simply an invariant equivalence relation whose classes are orbits of a fixed subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$.

All of these results were essentially superseded by Fact 2.16 below. obtained via a novel application of topological dynamics in model theory. It was, in part, based on the following simple remark.

Fact 2.15 ([KPR15, Remark 1.11])**.** *If E is an invariant equivalence relation defined on a single complete type $[a]_\equiv$ over $\emptyset$, then E has a type-definable class if and only if E is type-definable.*

Fact 2.16 ([KPR15, Theorem 5.1])**.** *We are working in a monster model $\mathfrak{C}$ of a complete, countable theory. Suppose we have:*

- *a $\emptyset$-type-definable, countably supported set X,*
- *a bounded, invariant equivalence relation E on X,*
- *a type-definable and E-saturated set $Y \subseteq X$.*

Then, for every type $p \in X_\emptyset$, either $E\restriction_{Y\cap p(\mathfrak{C})}$ is type-definable [in which case – provided $Y \cap p(\mathfrak{C}) \neq \emptyset$ – $E\restriction_{p(\mathfrak{C})}$ is type-definable as well, by Fact 2.15], or $E\restriction_{Y\cap p(\mathfrak{C})}$ is not smooth.

The theorem also has a counterpart for definable groups (as did the main results of [KR14; KM14]). This can be seen as an analogue of Fact 2.5.

Fact 2.17 ([KPR15, Corollary 5.7])**.** *Assume the language is countable. Suppose that G is a definable group and $H \leq G$ subgroup of bounded*

index, invariant over a countable set A. Suppose in addition that $K \geq H$ is a type-definable subgroup of G. Then $E_H{\restriction}_K$ is smooth if and only if H is type-definable (where E_H is the relation on G of lying in the same left coset of H.)

(Note that in [KPR15], G and H were invariant over $\emptyset$, but this is an equivalent formulation, as we can add countably many parameters as constants to the language.)

Note that in the context of Facts 2.16 and 2.17 there is a transitive group action (of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ on $p(\mathfrak{C})$ and of G on itself).

What we achieve in this paper is essentially a generalisation of Fact 2.15 which we can combine with Facts 2.16 and 2.17 to prove their extensions, in the form of Corollaries 7.7 and 6.5 (these corollaries do not literally extend the Facts, but see the remarks following them to see how we can obtain their variants which do).

3. Abstract orbital and weakly orbital equivalence relations

In this section, G is an arbitrary group, while X is a G-space, and neither has any additional structure. The goal of this section is to define what orbital and weakly orbital equivalence relations are, and then to understand them. If the reader is inclined to avoid the technicalities related to the weakly orbital case, she may opt to read this section only up to Subsection 3.1.

The most basic definition we intend to use is that of an invariant relation.

Definition 3.1. A relation R on X is said to be (G-)*invariant* if for every $g \in G$ and $x_1, x_2 \in X$ we have $x_1 \, R \, x_2$ if and only if $gx_1 \, R \, gx_2$.

Example 3.2. Let $G = \mathrm{SO}(2)$ act naturally on $X = S^1$. Then for each angle θ, we have the invariant equivalence relation E_θ, such that $z_1 \, E_\theta \, z_2$ exactly when z_1 and z_2 differ by an integer multiple of θ. □

3.1. Orbital equivalence relations.

To every invariant equivalence relation, we can attach a canonical subgroup of G.

Definition 3.3. If E is an invariant equivalence relation, then we define H_E as the group of all elements of G which preserve every E-class setwise.

A dual concept to that of H_E is E_H.

Definition 3.4. For any $H \leq G$, we denote by E_H the equivalence relation on X of lying in the same H-orbit.

Example 3.5. E_H need not be invariant: for example, if $G = X$ is acting on itself by left translations, then E_H (whose classes are just the right cosets of H) is invariant if and only if H is a normal subgroup of G. □

Remark 3.6. If E is an invariant equivalence relation on X, then H_E is normal in G.

In the other direction, if $H \trianglelefteq G$, then E_H is an invariant equivalence relation on X.

Proof. Let $h \in H_E$ and $g \in G$. We need to show that for any x we have $x \; E \; ghg^{-1}x$.

Put $y = g^{-1}x$. Then $y \; E \; hy$. By invariance, $gy \; E \; ghy$. But $gy = x$ and $ghy = ghg^{-1}x$. This completes the proof of the first part.

For the second part, just note that if H is normal, then $g[x]_{E_H} = gHx = Hgx = [gx]_{E_H}$. □

The orbital equivalence relations – defined below – are extremely well-behaved among the invariant equivalence relations.

Definition 3.7. An invariant equivalence relation E is said to be *orbital* if there is a subgroup H of G such that $E = E_H$ (i.e. E is the relation of lying in the same orbit of H).

(Note that if E is orbital, then $E \subseteq E_G$, so E-classes are subsets of G-orbits.)

Example 3.8. The equivalence relation from Example 3.2 is orbital: if $H \leq SO(2)$ is the group generated by the rotation by θ, then $E_\theta = E_H$. □

Remark 3.9.

- If E is an invariant equivalence relation on X, then $E_{H_E} \subseteq E$.
- If, in addition, E is orbital, then $E = E_{H_E}$.

Proof. The first part is obvious.

The second is immediate from the assumption that E is orbital: if $E = E_H$, then clearly $H \leq H_E$, so $E_H \subseteq E_{H_E}$ and the remark follows. □

Remark 3.10. Let $H \leq G$.

- If E_H is an invariant equivalence relation, we have $H \leq H_{E_H}$.
- If, in addition, the action of G on X is free, then $H = H_{E_H}$ and $H \trianglelefteq G$.

Proof. The first part is obvious.

For the second part, let us fix some $g \in H_{E_H}$, i.e. $g \in G$ which preserves all E_H-classes. Then for any $x \in X$ we have $x \; E_H \; g \cdot x$, so $g \cdot x = h \cdot x$ for some $h \in H$. But then by freeness $g = h$, so we have $g = h \in H$, and hence $H_E \leq H$. Finally, $H = H_{E_H}$ is normal by Remark 3.6. □

Corollary 3.11. *Every orbital equivalence relation is of the form E_H for some $H \trianglelefteq G$. If the action is free, then the correspondence is bijective: every $N \trianglelefteq G$ is of the form H_E for some orbital E.*

In particular, if G is simple, then the only orbital equivalence relations on X are the equality and E_G.

Proof. Immediate by Remarks 3.6, 3.9, and 3.10. □

Proposition 3.12. *If G is commutative and the action of G on X is transitive, then all invariant equivalence relations on X are orbital. In particular, they all correspond to subgroups of G.*

Proof. Let E be an invariant equivalence relation on X. Fix an $x \in X$ and let H be the stabiliser of $[x]_E$. Then $Hx = [x]_E$ (because the action is transitive) and for any $g \in G$, the stabiliser of $[gx]_E$ is $g^{-1}Hg$. But since G is commutative, $gHg^{-1} = H$, so $[gx]_E = Hgx$. Since the action is transitive, it follows that $E = E_H$. □

Example 3.13. The action of $\mathrm{SO}(2)$ on S^1 is free, and the group is commutative. This implies that the orbital equivalence relations correspond exactly to subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}(2)$ (in fact, because the action is transitive, those are all the invariant equivalence relations). □

Example 3.14. Consider the natural action of $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ on S^2. Certainly, the trivial and total relations are both invariant equivalence relations. Moreover, it is not hard to see that the equivalence relation identifying antipodal points is also invariant.

In fact, those three are the only invariant equivalence relations: if a point $x \in S^2$ is E-equivalent to some $y \in S^2 \setminus \{x, -x\}$ for some invariant equivalence relation E, then by applying rotations around axis containing x, we deduce that x is equivalent to every point in a whole circle containing y, and in particular, all those points are in $[x]_E$.

But then any rotation close to $\mathrm{id} \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ takes the circle to another circle which intersects it – and thus, by transitivity, the "rotated" circle will still be a subset of $[x]_E$. It is easy to see that we can then "polish" the whole sphere with (compositions of) small rotations applied to the initial circle, so in fact $[x]_E$ is the whole $\mathrm{SO}(3)$.

The total and trivial equivalence relations are orbital, but the antipodism is not – it is not hard to verify directly, but it also follows from Corollary 3.11, as $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ is a simple group. □

3.2. **Weakly orbital equivalence relations.** As mentioned in the introduction, we want to find a generalisation of orbitality which includes equivalence relations invariant under transitive group actions. Here we define such a notion, and in Subsection 3.3 we will see that it does indeed include both cases.

Definition 3.15. We say that E is a *weakly orbital* equivalence relation if there is some $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ and a subgroup $H \leq G$ such that

$$x_1 \; E \; x_2 \iff \exists g \in G \; \exists h \in H \quad gx_1 = hgx_2 \in \tilde{X}.$$

or equivalently,

$$x_1 \; E \; x_2 \iff \exists g_1, g_2 \in G \quad g_1 x_1 = g_2 x_2 \in \tilde{X} \wedge g_2 g_1^{-1} \in H,$$

(In other words, two points are equivalent if we can find some $g \in G$ which takes the first point to some $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$, and the second point to something E_H-related to $\tilde{x}$.)

Note that, as in the orbital case, a weakly orbital equivalence relation is always a refinement of E_G.

Example 3.16. The antipodism equivalence relation from Example 3.14 is weakly orbital: choose any point $\tilde{x} \in S^2$, and then choose a single rotation $\theta \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ which takes $\tilde{x}$ to $-\tilde{x}$. Put $\tilde{X} := \{\tilde{x}\}$ and $H := \langle\theta\rangle$. Then H and $\tilde{X}$ witness that the antipodism is weakly orbital. (We will see in Proposition 3.27 that this is no coincidence: transitivity of the group action implies that every invariant equivalence relation is weakly orbital.) □

For further examples of weakly orbital equivalence relations, see Subsection 3.4.

We can justify the name "weakly orbital": suppose E is weakly orbital on X, as witnessed by $\tilde{X}$ and H.

We can attempt to define a right action of G on X thus: for any $x \in X$, pick some $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ such that $x \in G \cdot \tilde{x}$, and let $g_0 \in G$ be such that $g_0\tilde{x} = x$. Then it seems natural to define $x \cdot g := g_0 \cdot g \cdot \tilde{x}$.

The problem with this is that it is not, in general, well-defined: the value on the right hand side may depend on the choice of $\tilde{x}$, and even if we do fix $\tilde{x}$, it may nonetheless depend on the choice of g_0.

If, however, we are somehow in a situation where this is a well-defined right group action, E would be the orbit equivalence relation of H acting on the right.

To sum up, one can say that a weakly orbital equivalence relation is the relation of lying in the same orbit of an "imaginary group action".

We will see later, in Remark 3.29, another interpretation of weak orbitality, which is more closely tied to the applications in later sections.

The following notation (and its alternative definition in Remark 3.18) is extremely important, as we will use it very often in the rest of the paper.

Definition 3.17. For arbitrary $H \leq G$ and $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$, let us denote by $R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ the relation (which may not be an equivalence relation) defined by

$$x_1 \; R_{H,\tilde{X}} \; x_2 \iff \exists g \in G \; \exists h \in H \quad gx_1 = hgx_2 \in \tilde{X}.$$

Remark 3.18. Note that $R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ may also be defined as the smallest relation R such that:

- R is invariant,
- for each $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ and $h \in H$ we have $\tilde{x} \; R \; h\tilde{x}$. □

Remark 3.19.

(1) $R_{?,?}$ is monotone, i.e. if $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ and $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq \tilde{X}_2$, then $R_{H_1,\tilde{X}_1} \subseteq R_{H_2,\tilde{X}_2}$.
(2) If $R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ is an equivalence relation (or merely reflexive), then for any $x \in X$ we have $(G{\cdot}x) \cap \tilde{X} \neq \emptyset$ (or, equivalently, $G{\cdot}\tilde{X} = X$).
(3) E is weakly orbital if and only if $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ for some H, $\tilde{X}$.
(4) If for every $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ we have $H_1\tilde{x} = H_2\tilde{x}$, then $R_{H_1,\tilde{X}} = R_{H_2,\tilde{X}}$. □

We can give an explicit description of "classes" of $R_{H,\tilde{X}}$.

Lemma 3.20. *Let $R = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$. For every $x_0 \in X$, we have*

$$\{x \mid x_0 \; R \; x\} = \bigcup_g g^{-1}Hg \cdot x_0,$$

where the union runs over $g \in G$ such that $g \cdot x_0 \in \tilde{X}$.

Proof. If $x_0 \; R \; x$, then we have $gx_0 = hgx \in \tilde{X}$ for some $g \in G$ and $h \in H$. But then $x = g^{-1}h^{-1}gx_0$. On the other hand, if $x = g^{-1}hgx_0$ for some $h \in H$ and $g \in G$ such that $gx_0 \in \tilde{X}$, then $h^{-1}gx = gx_0 \in \tilde{X}$. □

Definition 3.21. We say that H is a *maximal witness* for weak orbitality of E if there is some $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ such that $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ and for any $H' \gneq H$ we have $E \neq R_{H',\tilde{X}}$.

Similarly, we say that $\tilde{X}$ is a *maximal witness* for weak orbitality of E if there is some $H \leq G$ such that $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ and for any $\tilde{X}' \supsetneq \tilde{X}$ we have $E \neq R_{H,\tilde{X}'}$.

We say that a pair $(H, \tilde{X})$ is a *maximal pair of witnesses* for weak orbitality of E if $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ and for any $H' \geq H$, $\tilde{X} \supseteq X$ we have that $E = R_{H',\tilde{X}'}$ if and only if $H = H'$ and $\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}'$

The following proposition is, in part, an analogue of Remark 3.9 (only for weakly orbital equivalence relations, instead of orbital).

Lemma 3.22. *Consider $R = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$. Then:*

- *$R = R_{H,\tilde{X}'}$, where $\tilde{X}' := \{x \in X \mid \forall h \in H \;\; x \; R \; hx\}$, and*
- *$R = R_{H',\tilde{X}}$, where $H' := \{g \in G \mid \forall \tilde{x} \in \tilde{X} \;\; \tilde{x} \; R \; g\tilde{x}\}$.*

Moreover, if $R = E$ is an equivalence relation, then:

- *each of $\tilde{X}'$ and H' is a maximal witness in the sense of Definition 3.21,*
- *applying the two operations, in either order, yields a maximal pair of witnesses,*
- *every maximal witness $\tilde{X}$ is a union of E-classes.*

Proof. For the first bullet, R is an invariant relation such that for all $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}'$ and $h \in H$ we have $\tilde{x} \; R \; h\tilde{x}$. Since $R_{H,\tilde{X}'}$ is, by Remark 3.18,

the finest such relation, it follows that $R_{H,\tilde{X}'} \subseteq R$. On the other hand, $\tilde{X} \subseteq \tilde{X}'$, so $R = R_{H,\tilde{X}} \subseteq R_{H,\tilde{X}'}$. The second bullet is analogous.

The first two bullets of the "moreover" part are clear. For the third, we only need to see that $\tilde{X}'$ is a union of E-classes. For that, just notice that if $x \mathrel{E} hx$ and $y \mathrel{E} x$, then $y \mathrel{E} hx$ and (by invariance of E) $hx \mathrel{E} hy$, so in fact $y \mathrel{E} hy$. □

Note that, in contrast to the orbital case, where we have a canonical maximal witness (namely, H_E), in the weakly orbital case, the maximal pairs of witnesses are, in general, far from canonical, for instance because for any $g \in G$ we have $R_{H,\tilde{X}} = R_{gHg^{-1},g\cdot\tilde{X}}$. But even up to this kind of conjugation, the choice may not be canonical, as we see in the following example.

Example 3.23. Let F be any field, and consider the action of the affine group $F^3 \rtimes \mathrm{GL}_3(F)$ on itself by left translations. Put:

- $H_1 = (F^2 \times \{0\}) \times \{I\}$,
- $H_2 = (F \times \{0\}^2) \times \{I\}$,
- $\tilde{X}_1 = F^3 \times \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_3(F) \mid g^{-1}H_1g = H_1\}$, and
- $\tilde{X}_2 = F^3 \times \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_3(F) \mid g^{-1}H_2g \subseteq H_1\}$.

Then, using Lemma 3.20, we deduce that $E = R_{H_1,\tilde{X}_1} = R_{H_2,\tilde{X}_2}$ is an orbital equivalence relation (which on $F^3 \times \{I\}$ is just lying in the same plane parallel to $F^2 \times \{0\}$). On the other hand, both pairs $H_1, \tilde{X}_1$ and $H_2, \tilde{X}_2$ are maximal, and simultaneously, $\tilde{X}_1 \subsetneq \tilde{X}_2$ and $H_2 \subsetneq H_1$. If F is a finite field, the sets and groups don't even have the same cardinality, and they are certainly not conjugate even if F is infinite. □

3.3. **Orbitality and weak orbitality; transitive actions.** Now, we proceed to show that weakly orbital do indeed satisfy their stated objective of generalising the orbital equivalence relations and equivalence relations invariant under transitive actions.

Proposition 3.24. *Every orbital equivalence relation is weakly orbital. In fact, if $E = E_H$ is an invariant equivalence relation, then $E = R_{H,X} (= R_{H_E,X})$.*

Conversely, if $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ is an invariant equivalence relation and $H \trianglelefteq G$, then $E = E_H$, so a weakly orbital equivalence relation is orbital precisely when there is a normal group witnessing the weak orbitality.

Proof. For the first half, E_H is by the definition the finest relation such that for each $x \in X$ and $h \in H$ we have $x \mathrel{E_H} hx$. If it is also invariant, we have by Remark 3.18 that $R_{H,X} = E_H$.

The second half is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.20. □

Corollary 3.25. *If G is a commutative group, then every weakly orbital equivalence relation is orbital.* □

The next corollary shows that a proper inclusion $\tilde{X} \subsetneq X$ is another obstruction of orbitality (other than non-normality of H). This shows that $\tilde{X}$ is necessary in the definition of weak orbitality.

Corollary 3.26. *A weakly orbital equivalence E relation is orbital precisely when we can choose as the witness $\tilde{X}$ the whole domain X, i.e. $E = R_{H,X}$ for some $H \leq G$.*

Proof. That weak orbitality of an orbital equivalence relation is witnessed by $X = \tilde{X}$ is a part of Proposition 3.24.

In the other direction, if $E = R_{H,X}$, then we can define the maximal witnessing group H' as in Lemma 3.22. Since $X = \tilde{X}$, this H' coincides with H_E, so it is normal by Remark 3.6. But then by Lemma 3.22 and Proposition 3.24 we have $R_{H,X} = R_{H',X} = E_{H'}$, so E is orbital. □

Orbital equivalence relations are weakly orbital as witnessed by $\tilde{X} = X$. Equivalence relations invariant under transitive actions are, in a sense, an orthogonal class: in their case, we can choose a singleton $\tilde{X}$.

Proposition 3.27. *Suppose the action of G is transitive, and $\tilde{x} \in X$ is arbitrary. Then for any invariant equivalence relation E we have $E = R_{\mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\},\{\tilde{x}\}}$ (where $\mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\}$ is the setwise stabiliser of $[\tilde{x}]_E$, i.e. $\{g \in G \mid \tilde{x}\ E\ g\tilde{x}\}$).*

Proof. Choose any x_1, x_2 and let g_1, g_2 be such that $g_1 x_1 = g_2 x_2 = \tilde{x}$ (those exist by the transitivity). To complete the proof, it is enough to show that $h = g_2 g_1^{-1} \in \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\}$ if and only if $x_1\ E\ x_2$ (because $hg_1x_2 = g_2x_2$).

Note that $g_2 g_1^{-1} \in \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\}$ if and only if $\tilde{x}\ E\ g_2 g_1^{-1}(\tilde{x})$. But, since E is invariant, this is equivalent to $g_2^{-1}\tilde{x}\ E\ g_1^{-1}\tilde{x}$. But $g_1^{-1}\tilde{x} = x_1$ and $g_2^{-1}\tilde{x} = x_2$, so we are done. □

Note that Corollary 3.25 and Proposition 3.27 provide an alternative proof of Proposition 3.12.

Note also that even for transitive actions, $R_{H,\{\tilde{x}\}}$ is not in general an equivalence relation, as it may fail to be transitive.

Example 3.28. Consider G be the free group of rank 2, and let a, b be its free generators. Let $H = \langle b \rangle$ and $K = \langle a \rangle$. Put $X = G/K$ with G acting on X by left translations, and finally, put $\tilde{x} = eK \in X$ and $R = R_{H,\{\tilde{x}\}}$. Then $eK\ R\ bK$, and also $eK = a \cdot (eK)\ R\ a \cdot (bK) = abK$. Therefore, $b \cdot (eK) = bK\ R\ b \cdot (abK) = babK$. But it is not true that $eK\ R\ babK$ (indeed, by Lemma 3.20, $eK\ R\ gK$ if and only if $gK = a^n b^m K$ for some integers n, m), so R is not transitive. □

Remark 3.29. Given an arbitrary invariant equivalence relation E on X, we can attach to each G-orbit $G \cdot \tilde{x}$ with a fixed "base point" $\tilde{x}$ a subgroup $H_{\tilde{x}} := \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\}$, such that $G \cdot \tilde{x}/E$ is isomorphic (as a G-space) with $G/H_{\tilde{x}}$.

Along with Lemma 3.20, this gives an intuitive description of weakly orbital equivalence relations (among the invariant equivalence relations) as those for which we have a set $\tilde{X}$ which restricts choice of "base points", and at the same time „uniformly" limits the manner in which the group $H_{\tilde{x}}$ changes between various orbits: we can only take a union of conjugates of a fixed subgroup.

In the later sections, we will consider the behaviour of E when $\tilde{X}$ is somehow well-behaved, and we can think of that as somehow "smoothing" the manner in which the group changes between the G-orbits.

3.4. **Further examples of weakly orbital equivalence relations.** In the first example, we define a class of examples of weakly orbital equivalence relations which are not orbital, on spaces X such that $|X/G|$ is large (so the action is far from transitive).

Example 3.30. Consider the action of G on $X = G^2$ by left translation in the first coordinate only. Let $\tilde{X} \subseteq G^2$ be the diagonal, and H be any subgroup of G. Then $R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ is a weakly orbital equivalence relation on X whose classes are sets of the form $(g_1 g_2^{-1} H g_2) \times \{g_2\}$. The relation is orbital if and only if H is normal (because the action is free), while $|X/G| = |G|$. □

The second example is a vast generalisation of its predecessor (in fact, every weakly orbital equivalence relation is of this form).

Example 3.31. Let G be any group, while $H \leq G$ is a subgroup. Suppose $(X_i)_{i\in I}$ are disjoint G-spaces with subsets $\tilde{X}_i$, such that $R_{H,\tilde{X}_i}$ is a weakly orbital equivalence relation on X_i. Let X be the disjoint union $\coprod_{i\in I} X_i$. Put $\tilde{X} = \bigcup_{i\in I} \tilde{X}_i$. Then $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ is a weakly orbital equivalence relation (which is just the union $\coprod_{i\in I} R_{H,\tilde{X}_i}$). □

The third example shows how we can, in a way, join weakly orbital equivalence relations on different G-spaces, for varying G.

Example 3.32. Suppose we have a family of groups $(G_i)_{i\in I}$ acting on spaces $(X_i)_{i\in I}$ (respectively), and that on each X_i we have a [weakly] orbital equivalence relation E_i. Then the product $G = \prod_{i\in I} G_i$ acts on the disjoint union $X = \coprod_{i\in I} X_i$ naturally (i.e $(g_i)_i \cdot x = g_j \cdot x$ when $x \in X_j$) and $E = \coprod_{i\in I} E_i$ is [weakly] orbital. □

The final example shows us that we cannot, in general, choose $\tilde{X}$ as a transversal of X/G (i.e. a set intersecting each orbit at precisely one point).

Example 3.33. Let F be an arbitrary field. Consider the affine group $G = F^3 \rtimes \mathrm{GL}_3(F)$, and let G' be a copy of G, disjoint from it.

Let $\ell \subseteq F^3$ be a line containing the origin. Choose a plane $\pi \subseteq F^3$ containing ℓ. Let E be the invariant equivalence relation on $X = G \sqcup G'$ (on which G acts by left translations) which is:

- on G: $(x_1, g_1)\ E\ (x_2, g_2)$ whenever $g_1 = g_2$ and $x_1 - x_2 \in g_2 \cdot \pi$,
- on G': $(x'_1, g'_1)\ E\ (x'_2, g'_2)$, whenever $g'_1 = g'_2$ and $x'_1 - x'_2 \in g'_2 \cdot \ell$ (slightly abusing the notation).

Put $H = \ell \times \{I\} \leq G$, let $A \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_3(F)$ be such that $A^{-1} \cdot l = \pi$ and $I \in A$, and finally let $\tilde{X} = (\{0'\} \times \{I'\}) \cup (\{0\} \times A)$ (where $0'$ is the neutral element in the vector space component of G').

Then E is weakly orbital, as witnessed by $\tilde{X}$ and H (to see this, recall Lemma 3.20 and notice that the E-class and $R_{\tilde{X},H}$-"class" of I both are the union of $I + a^{-1} \cdot \ell$ over $a \in A$, while the class of I' is just $I' + \ell$, and then use the fact that both E and $R_{\tilde{X},H}$ are invariant).

We will show that E does not have any $\tilde{X}_1$ witnessing weak orbitality which intersects each of G and G' at exactly one point. Suppose that $E = R_{H_1,\tilde{X}_1}$ and $\tilde{X}_1 \cap G = \{g\}$, while $\tilde{X}_1 \cap G' = \{g'\}$. Since the action of G on X is free, it follows from Lemma 3.20 that $[g]_E = H_1 g$ and $[g']_E = H_1 g'$. This implies that in fact $H_1 \leq F^3$, and the first equality implies that H_1 is a plane, while the second one implies that it is a line, which is a contradiction. □

4. Abstract structured equivalence relations

In this section, we consider an action of a group G on a set X, but we also put on them some additional structure: namely, we have on each finite product of G and X (as sets) a lattice of sets (i.e. a family closed under finite unions and intersections) which we call pseudo-closed, such that the empty set and the whole space is always pseudo-closed. In the remainder of this section, the lattices are implicitly present and fixed.

Note that the lattices may not be closed under arbitrary intersection (so they need not be the lattices of closed sets in the topological sense) and we do not necessarily assume that the lattice on a product is the product lattice (so even if, say, the pseudo-closed sets on X are actually closed sets in a topology, there might be a pseudo-closed set in X^2 which is not closed in the product topology).

Naturally, we need to impose some compatibility conditions on the group action and the lattices of pseudo-closed sets.

Definition 4.1. We say that the lattices of pseudo-closed sets *agree* with the group action of G on X (or, leaving the lattice implicit, G acts *agreeably* on X) if we have the following:

(1) sections of pseudo-closed sets are pseudo-closed,
(2) products of pseudo-closed sets are pseudo-closed,
(3) the map $G \times X \to X$ defined by the formula $(g, x) \mapsto g \cdot x$ is pseudo-continuous (i.e. the preimages of pseudo-closed sets are pseudo-closed),
(4) for each $g \in G$, the map $X \to X \times X$ defined by the formula $x \mapsto (x, g \cdot x)$ is pseudo-continuous,

(5) the restriction $\pi\restriction_{E_G}$ of the projection onto the first two coordinates $\pi\colon (X^2)^2 \to X^2$ is a pseudo-closed mapping (i.e. images of relatively pseudo-closed sets are pseudo-closed), where $(x_1, x_2)\ E_G\ (x_1', x_2')$ when there is some $g \in G$ such that $x_1' = gx_1$ and $x_2' = gx_2$,
(6) the map $X \times G \to X \times X$ defined by the formula $(x, g) \mapsto (x, g \cdot x)$ is pseudo-closed.

Example 4.2. A prototypical example of an agreeable group action is any continuous action of a compact Hausdorff group on a compact Hausdorff space, where pseudo-closed means simply closed. Definition 4.1 is easy to verify there, as all the functions under consideration are continuous, and hence closed (as continuous functions between compact spaces and Hausdorff spaces). Section 5 is dedicated to the generalisation of this example where we only assume that the group is compact, not the space it acts on. □

Lemma 4.3. *If G acts agreeably on X and E is an invariant equivalence relation, then for each $h \in G$ and $\tilde{x} \in X$:*

- $\mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\} = \{g \in G \mid \tilde{x}\ E\ g\tilde{x}\}$ *is pseudo-closed whenever $[x]_E$ is pseudo-closed,*
- $\{x \in X \mid x\ E\ hx\}$ *is pseudo-closed whenever E is pseudo-closed.*

Proof. For the first bullet, the set in question is a section at x of the preimage of $[x]_E$ via the map $(g, x) \mapsto g \cdot x$, so it is pseudo-closed by agreeability.

For the second bullet, the set is the preimage of E via $x \mapsto (x, hx)$, so it is pseudo-closed by agreeability. □

Theorem 4.4 (Meta-theorem 1 for abstract G)**.** *If G acts agreeably on X, while E is an orbital equivalence relation, and the lattice of pseudo-closed sets in G is downwards $[G : H_E]$-complete (i.e. closed under intersections of at most $[G : H_E]$ sets), then the following are equivalent:*

(1) E is pseudo-closed,
(2) each E-class is pseudo-closed,
(3) H_E is pseudo-closed,
(4) $E = E_H$ for some pseudo-closed $H \leq G$.

Proof. If E is pseudo-closed, then each E-class is pseudo-closed (as a section of E), so we have (1)⇒(2).

To see that (2)⇒(3), note that

$$H_E = \bigcap_{\tilde{x} \in X} \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[\tilde{x}]_E\}.$$

By Lemma 4.3, the stabilisers are pseudo-closed. The intersection may not be small, but each of the stabilisers is a group containing H_E, so a

union of cosets of H_E in G. It follows that to calculate the intersection, we only need to see which cosets are dropped from it, and since there are only $[G : H_E]$ many to drop, completeness tells us that $H = H_E$ is pseudo-closed.

(3)⇒(4) is a weakening (by Remark 3.9).

For (4)⇒(1), notice that E_H is the image of $X \times H$ by the map $(x, g) \mapsto (x, g \cdot x)$, which is pseudo-closed by agreeability. □

It makes sense to consider the question about when the closedness of classes implies the closedness of the whole equivalence relation. The following example shows that if simply we drop the orbitality assumption in Theorem 4.4, the implication no longer holds.

Example 4.5. Consider the action of $G = \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$ on $X = \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}^+\}$ by changing the first coordinate. This is an agreeable action, as a special case of Example 4.2 (so pseudo-closed = closed).

Consider the equivalence relation E on X such that its classes are $\{(0, 0)\}$, $\{(1, 0)\}$, and $\{(0, \frac{1}{n}), (1, \frac{1}{n})\}$, where $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$. Clearly, E is invariant and all its classes are closed, but it is not itself closed. □

The following definition makes for more elegant statements of the remaining results.

Definition 4.6. We say that an invariant equivalence relation E is *weakly orbital by pseudo-closed* if there is a pseudo-closed set $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ and a (not necessarily pseudo-closed) group $H \leq G$ such that $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$.

(We will also replace the epithet "pseudo-closed" in the above definition by others in the more concrete applications, so e.g. in the context of Example 4.2, we would talk about "weakly orbital by closed" equivalence relations.)

Theorem 4.7 (Meta-theorem 2 for abstract G)**.** *If in Theorem 4.4 we assume that E is only weakly orbital (instead of orbital), and add the assumption that the lattice of pseudo-closed sets in X is also downwards $[G : H_E]$-complete, then the following are equivalent:*

(1) E is pseudo-closed,
(2) each E-class is pseudo-closed and E is weakly orbital by pseudo-closed,
(3) $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ for some pseudo-closed H and $\tilde{X}$,
(4) for every $H \leq G$ and $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$, if either of H or $\tilde{X}$ is a maximal *witness to weak orbitality of E, then it is also pseudo-closed.*

Proof. We will show the implications (1)⇒(2)⇒ (3) ⇒ (1), and on the way, that the three conditions imply (4) (which implies (3) by Lemma 3.22).

If we assume (1), then clearly all the classes are pseudo-closed (as sections of E), and we have H_1, $\tilde{X}_1$ such that $E = R_{H_1,\tilde{X}_1}$ (because we have assumed that E is weakly orbital). Then we can put

$$\tilde{X} := \bigcap_{h \in H_1} \{x \in X \mid x \ E \ hx\}.$$

The sets we intersect are then pseudo-closed by Lemma 4.3. The intersection may be larger than $[G : H_E]$, but there are at most $[G : H_E]$-many distinct sets of the form $\{x \mid x \ E \ hx\}$: this is because if $h_0 \in H_E$, then $x \ E \ hx$ implies that $x \ E \ hh_0x$. This is because we have $x \ E \ h_0x$, and – by invariance of E – also $hx \ E \ hh_0x$.

It follows that we have the following equality:

$$\tilde{X} = \bigcap_{hH_E \in H_1/H_E} \{x \in X \mid x \ E \ hx\},$$

and therefore $\tilde{X}$ is pseudo-closed, and by Lemma 3.22, we have $E = R_{H_1,\tilde{X}}$, and hence (2). This also gives us the part of (4) pertaining to $\tilde{X}$: if $\tilde{X}_1$ was already maximal, as witnessed by H_1, then we would have $\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}_1$.

The implication (2)⇒(3) is showed the same way as the one in Theorem 4.4 (using Lemma 3.22), only we take the intersection over the pseudo-closed set $\tilde{X}$ (which we have by definition of weakly orbital by pseudo-closed) instead of the whole X. The same reasoning shows the remaining part of (4).

For (3)⇒(1), notice that $x_1 \ R_{H,\tilde{X}} \ x_2$ if and only if there are x_1' and x_2' such that $(x_1, x_2) \ E_G \ (x_1', x_2')$ (where E_G is defined as in Definition 4.1(5)), $x_1' \in \tilde{X}$ and $x_1' \ E_H \ x_2'$. Since H is pseudo-closed, we also have that E_H is pseudo-closed (just as in the final paragraph of the proof of Theorem 4.4), so overall, this is a condition about (x_1, x_2, x_1', x_2') which is relatively pseudo-closed in E_G, and the projection onto the first two coordinates (which is just $E = E_{H,\tilde{X}}$) is also pseudo-closed (by Definition 4.1(5)). □

Remark 4.8. Since X itself is its own pseudo-closed subset, one can use Proposition 3.24 and Corollary 3.26 to show that for orbital E, the conclusion of Theorem 4.7 implies the conclusion of Theorem 4.4, so, if we ignore the completeness assumptions, Theorem 4.7 implies Theorem 4.4. □

One might ask if in Theorem 4.7, we could have weakened the condition (2) to say only that each class is pseudo-closed (or, equivalently, the condition (3) to say only that H is pseudo-closed). But this is not the case – as explained in Remark 3.29, we need the $\tilde{X}$ to control the way E changes between G-orbits. This is shown in the following example.

Example 4.9. Let $G = S_3$ act naturally on $S_3 \times \{0, \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}^+\}$. This is another special case of Example 4.2, so this action is agreeable. Let $H = \{(), (1,2)\}$, and let $\tilde{X} = \{((1,2,3),0), ((), \frac{1}{n}) \mid n \in \mathbf{N}^+\}$. Then $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ is weakly orbital, H is pseudo-closed, as are all the E-classes, but E is not (because $((),0)$ and $((1,2),0)$ are not related whereas each $((), \frac{1}{n})$ is related to $((1,2), \frac{1}{n})$). □

5. (Weakly) orbital equivalence relations for compact group actions

In this section, X is a (Hausdorff) G-space for a compact Hausdorff group G (and the action is continuous). The pseudo-closed sets are just the closed sets in respective spaces. Then pseudo-continuity and pseudo-closedness of functions are just the usual topological continuity and closedness. Note that the results of this section also apply in largely unchanged form to proper group actions – see Remark 5.9.

5.1. **Preparatory lemmas in the case of compact group actions.** We have seen in Example 4.2 that a continuous action of a compact Hausdorff group G on a compact Hausdorff space X is agreeable. It turns out that compactness of X is not necessary.

Lemma 5.1. *Actions of compact groups are agreeable (with respect to the standard closed sets, according to Definition 4.1).*

Proof. Recall from Fact 2.1 that if G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X, then the multiplication $X \times G \to X$ $((x,g) \mapsto (g \cdot x))$ and the quotient $X \to X/G$ are both closed.

It is enough to demonstrate the last two points of Definition 4.1: that the projection mapping from E_G onto X^2 and the mapping $(x,g) \mapsto (x, g \cdot x)$ are both closed. The rest is straightforward (and does not rely on compactness of G).

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Delta(X^2) & \xhookrightarrow{\subseteq} & E_G & \xhookrightarrow{\subseteq} & (X^2)^2 \\ \approx\uparrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \Delta & \swarrow^{\pi\restriction_{E_G}} & q & & \\ X^2 & \xleftrightarrow{\approx} & E_G/G & & \end{array}$$

The commutative diagram of the functions discussed in the proof. Each of them is continuous and closed.

For the first one, consider the diagonal embedding $\Delta\colon X^2 \to \Delta(X^2)$ (as a subset of X^4) composed with the quotient map $q\colon E_G \to E_G/G \subseteq X^2 \times (X^2/G)$, where the quotient is with respect to the action defined by the formula $g \cdot (x_1, x_2, x_1', x_2') = (x_1, x_2, g \cdot x_1', g \cdot x_2')$. The first function is a homeomorphic embedding with closed image, and the second is a

closed map (by Fact 2.1, as a quotient map with respect to a compact group action).

Note that both q and $\pi\restriction_{E_G}$ are onto, and they glue together exactly those points which share the first two coordinates. It follows that we have an induced bijection between X^2 and E_G/G. But this bijection is just $q \circ \Delta$, which is continuous and closed, and therefore a homeomorphism.

This implies that $\pi\restriction_{E_G}$ must be closed (as the composition of q – which is closed – and $(q \circ \Delta)^{-1}$ – which is a homeomorphism).

The second one is immediate by Fact 2.4. □

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose G is a totally nonmeager topological group acting continuously (or even in a Borel way) and transitively on a Polish space X. If E is an invariant equivalence relation which is smooth (in the sense of Definition 2.6, i.e. it has a countable separating family of Borel sets), then for each $x_0 \in X$, the stabiliser $\mathrm{Stab}_G\{[x_0]_E\}$ is closed in G.*

Proof. Choose any $x_0 \in X$. Put $H := \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[x_0]_E\}$. We will use Fact 2.5 to show that H is closed.

Consider the map $\Psi\colon G \to X$ defined by $g \mapsto g \cdot x_0$. By invariance of E and the definition of H, we have $\Psi(g_1)\ E\ \Psi(g_2)$ if and only if $g_1[x_0]_E = g_2[x_0]_E$, i.e. $g_1 H = g_2 H$. This implies that the pullback of a countable separating family for E is a countable separating family for cosets of H in G.

Furthermore, since Ψ is continuous, a pullback of a family of Borel sets will be a family of Borel, and hence strictly Baire sets. Together with the conclusion of the preceding paragraph and Fact 2.5, this implies that H must be closed. □

5.2. **Results in the case of compact group actions.**

Theorem 5.3 (Meta-theorem 1 for compact G)**.** *Suppose G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X.*

The following are equivalent for an orbital invariant equivalence relation E on X:

1. *E is closed*
2. *each E-class is closed,*
3. *H_E is closed,*
4. *$E = E_H$ for a closed subgroup $H \leq G$,*
5. *X/E is Hausdorff.*

Proof. (5) clearly implies (1) (because E is the preimage of the diagonal by the quotient map $X^2 \to (X/E)^2$), while the implication from (4) to (5) is a consequence of Fact 2.1.

Notice that the lattice of closed sets is simply downwards complete, so the rest follows immediately from Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 5.1. □

The following examples show that we cannot drop the assumption that G is compact in Theorem 5.3, even if G is otherwise very tame.

Example 5.4. Consider the action of $G = \mathbf{R}$ on a two-dimensional torus $X = \mathbf{R}^2/\mathbf{Z}^2$ by translations along a line with an irrational slope (e.g. $t \cdot [x_1, x_2] = [x_1 + t, x_2 + t\sqrt{2}]$). Then for $H = G$ the relation E_G has dense (and not closed) orbits, so in particular, X/E_G has trivial topology. □

Example 5.5. Consider the action of $G = \mathbf{R}$ on $X = \mathbf{R}^2$ defined by the formula $t \cdot (x, y) = (x + ty, y)$. Then for $H = G$, the classes of E_G are the singletons along the line $y = 0$ and horizontal lines at $y \neq 0$, so they are closed, but E_G is not closed.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X.*

Then every closed orbital equivalence relation on X is of the form E_H for some closed $H \trianglelefteq G$. If the action is free, the correspondence is bijective: every closed $N \trianglelefteq G$ is of the form H_E for some closed orbital E.

In particular, if G is topologically simple, then the only closed orbital equivalence relations on X are the equality and E_G.

On the other hand, if G is commutative and the action is transitive, then all the closed invariant equivalence relations on X are of the form E_H for closed $H \leq G$.

Proof. Immediate from Corollary 3.11, Proposition 3.12 and Theorem 5.3. □

Recall that an invariant equivalence relation E is "weakly orbital by closed" if there is a closed $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ and any $H \leq G$ such that $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$.

Theorem 5.7 (Meta-theorem 2 for compact G)**.** *Suppose G is a compact Hausdorff group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X. Then the following are equivalent for a weakly orbital equivalence relation E:*

(1) E is closed,
(2) each E-class is closed and E is weakly orbital by closed,
(3) $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ for some closed H and $\tilde{X}$,
(4) for every $H \leq G$ and $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$, if either of H or $\tilde{X}$ is a maximal *witness to weak orbitality of E, then it is also closed.*

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 5.1. □

Notice that we do not (yet) have a counterpart of (5) in Theorem 5.3. (See also Question 8.3 and the accompanying discussion.)

Corollary 5.8 (Meta-corollary for compact G)**.** *Suppose that G is a compact Hausdorff group acting on a Polish space X. Suppose that E is an invariant equivalence relation on X which is orbital or weakly orbital by closed. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) E is closed,

(2) each E-class is closed,
(3) E is smooth,
(4) for each $x \in X$, the restriction $E\restriction_{G\cdot x}$ is closed.

Proof. Clearly, (1) implies (4), which implies (2).

By Theorem 5.3 or 5.7, (2) implies (1).

By Fact 2.7, (1) implies (3).

Finally, (3) implies that each restriction $E\restriction_{G\cdot x}$ is smooth, which – by Lemma 5.2 and compactness – implies (2), since $[x]_E = \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[x]_E\} \cdot x$. □

(Note that, since every orbital equivalence relation is weakly orbital by closed, the "orbital or" part of Corollary 5.8 is redundant.)

Remark 5.9. The results of this section can be generalised to proper group actions: one can show that if G is a Hausdorff topological group acting properly on a Hausdorff space X, then the conclusions of Fact 2.1 apply, and the action is agreeable (with much the same proof as that of Lemma 5.1, using the fact that a product of proper maps is proper). This immediately gives us analogues of Theorems 5.3 and 5.7. Under the additional assumption that G is totally nonmeager, this also gives us an analogue of Corollary 5.8. This is a generalisation of the case described in this section (by Fact 2.4).

6. Type-definable group actions

6.1. **Preparatory lemmas in the case of type-definable group actions.** In this section, G is a type-definable group, X is a type-definable set, while the action of G on X is also type-definable (in the sense that it has a type-definable graph), all in the monster model $\mathfrak{C}$.

Lemma 6.1. *If X is a type-definable set, G is a type-definable group acting in a type-definable way on X, then the action is agreeable (with respect to type-definable sets), according to Definition 4.1.*

Proof. Sections of (relatively) type-definable are clearly type-definable, as are products. Since the projection of a type-definable set is type-definable, the remaining points are straightforward as well (analogously to Example 4.2). □

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that the language is countable. Suppose we have a definable action of G on X (i.e. G is a definable group and the action of G on X has a definable graph) which is transitive. Let E be a bounded, G-invariant equivalence relation on X, which is also invariant over a countable set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ (i.e. $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$-invariant). Then E is smooth if and only if it is type-definable.*

Proof. Choose any point $\tilde{x} \in X$. Then $H = \mathrm{Stab}_G(\{[\tilde{x}]_E\})$ is invariant over $A \cup \{\tilde{x}\}$. Consider the map $\Psi\colon G \to X$ defined by $g \mapsto g \cdot \tilde{x}$. Then $\Psi^{-1}[E] = R_{H,\{e\}}$ is a left-invariant equivalence relation on G: the

relation of lying in the same left coset of H. Let us denote it by E'. It is easy to see that E is type-definable if and only if E' is.

Moreover, E is smooth if and only if E' is. To see that, let M be a countable model containing all the necessary parameters (i.e. $\tilde{x}$, A, the parameters in the definitions). Notice that because Ψ is an M-definable surjection, it induces a continuous surjection $\Psi_M \colon G_M \to X_M$, where G_M is the set of types over M of elements of G and similarly, X_M are the types over M of elements of X. A continuous surjection between compact Polish spaces always has a Borel section, so we can use Ψ_M and its section to transport the separating families between G_M and X_M.

But we know from Fact 2.17 that E' is type-definable if and only if it is smooth, so the same is true for E. □

6.2. **Results in the case of type-definable group actions.**

Theorem 6.3 (Meta-theorem 1 for type-definable G)**.** *Let G be a type-definable group acting type-definably on a type-definable set X.*

Suppose E is an orbital, G-invariant equivalence relation on X with G_A^{000}-invariant classes (for some small set A). Then the following are equivalent:

(1) E is type-definable,
(2) each E-class is type-definable,
(3) H_E is type-definable,
(4) there is a type-definable subgroup $H \leq G$ such that $E = E_H$.

In addition, if E is bounded (equivalently, if X/G is small), then the conditions are equivalent to the statement that X/E is Hausdorff with the logic topology.

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 4.4, Lemma 6.1 and Fact 2.10(6). Note that the completeness needed for Theorem 4.4 follows from the fact that $G_A^{000} \leq H_E$, so by definition $[G : H_E] \leq [G : G_A^{000}]$ is small. □

Recall that an invariant equivalence relation E is "weakly orbital by type-definable" if there is a type-definable $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ and any $H \leq G$ such that $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$

Theorem 6.4 (Meta-theorem 2 for type-definable G)**.** *In context of Theorem 6.3, if we assume instead that E is only weakly orbital, then the following are equivalent:*

(i) E is type-definable,
(ii) each E-class is type-definable and E is weakly orbital by type-definable,
(iii) $E = R_{H,\tilde{X}}$ for some type-definable H and $\tilde{X}$,
(iv) for every $H \leq G$ and $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$, if either of H or $\tilde{X}$ is a maximal *witness for weak orbitality of E, then it is also type-definable.*

In addition, if E is bounded (equivalently, X/G is bounded), then the conditions are equivalent to statement that X/E is Hausdorff with logic topology.

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 4.7, Lemma 6.1 and Fact 2.10(6). □

Corollary 6.5 (Meta-corollary for type-definable G)**.** *Assume that the theory is countable. Suppose G is a definable group acting definably on X, while E is a bounded, G-invariant equivalence relation on X, which is also invariant over a countable set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. Assume in addition that E is orbital or weakly orbital by type-definable. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) E is type-definable,
(2) each E-class is type-definable,
(3) E is smooth,
(4) X/E is Hausdorff,
(5) for each $x \in X$, the restriction $E\restriction_{G\cdot x}$ is type-definable.

Proof. Clearly,(1) implies (5), which implies (2).

By Theorem 6.3 or 6.4, (2) implies (1) (note that the assumptions that E is bounded and A-invariant imply together that E-classes are G^{000}_A-invariant).

(1) implies (3) by Fact 2.14, and it is equivalent to (4) by Fact 2.10(6).

Finally, (3) implies that each restriction $E\restriction_{G\cdot x}$ is smooth, which – by Lemma 6.2 – implies (5). □

(Note that any orbital equivalence relation is also weakly orbital by type-definable, so the "orbital or" part is redundant.)

Remark 6.6. Corollary 6.5 can be slightly generalised: if we have a definable group action of G on X, a type-definable group $K \leq G$, and some K-invariant $Y \subseteq X$, then Corollary 6.5 remains true if we replace G and X with K and Y (respectively), which is a direct generalisation of Fact 2.17 (where we have $X = G$, $Y = K$ and $E = E_H$).

To show that, we only need to see that the appropriate generalisation of Lemma 6.2 is true (with essentially the same proof).

7. (Weakly) orbital equivalence relations for automorphism groups

In this section, X is a $\emptyset$-type-definable subset of a small product of sorts in $\mathfrak{C}$, while G is just $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$. We use the letter σ for general automorphisms (i.e. members of $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$), and Γ and γ where we would use H and h in the rest of the paper, so as to follow the notation of [KR14].

It is worth noting that in contrast to Sections 5 and 6, we will not apply Theorems 4.4 and 4.7 directly. Instead, we will apply them to the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ on $X/\equiv_L$, and the preparatory lemmas will provide us with tools to translate the result back to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ and X.

More precisely, we identify $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ with $[m]_{\equiv}/{\equiv_L}$ for a tuple m enumerating a small model, as explained in Fact 2.10(3), and the pseudo-closed sets are the sets closed in logic topology: for example, a pseudo-closed set in $\mathrm{Gal}(T) \times X/{\equiv_L} = ([m]_{\equiv} \times X)/({\equiv_L} \times {\equiv_L})$ is a set whose preimage in $[m]_{\equiv} \times X$ is type-definable. Note that it is *not* a priori the same as being closed in the product of logic topologies on $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ and $X/{\equiv_L}$! Similarly, the product relation ${\equiv_L} \times {\equiv_L}$ on a product of two invariant sets is usually not the finest bounded invariant equivalence relation on it (so it coarser than $\equiv_L$ on the product).

As a side result, we will show that orbitality and weak orbitality are well-defined for bounded invariant equivalence relations, see Corollary 7.3.

7.1. **Preparatory lemmas in the case of automorphism group action.**

Lemma 7.1. *If X is a type-definable set, then the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ on $X/{\equiv_L}$ is agreeable (with respect to sets closed in logic topology, according to Definition 4.1.*

Proof. For brevity, let us write $\bar{x}$, for any $[x]_{\equiv_L} \in X/{\equiv_L}$, as well as $\bar{\sigma}$ for $\sigma \operatorname{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C}) \in \mathrm{Gal}(T)$, and $\bar{n}$ for $[n]_{\equiv_L} \in [m]_{\equiv}/{\equiv_L}$ (which, by Fact 2.10(3), we identify with the sole $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathrm{Gal}(T)$ such that $\bar{\sigma}(\bar{m}) = \bar{n}$, where $\bar{m} = [m]_{\equiv_L}$).

Consider the partial type $\Phi(n, x, y) = (mx \equiv ny \wedge x \in X)$.

Claim. For any $n \in [m]_{\equiv}$ and $x, y \in X$, the following are equivalent:

- $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{x} = \bar{y}$,
- $\models (\exists y')\Phi(n, x, y') \wedge y \equiv_L y'$, and
- $\models (\exists n')\Phi(n', x, y) \wedge n \equiv_L n'$.

Proof. Suppose $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{x} = \bar{y}$. Then we have some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $\sigma(\bar{m}) = \bar{n}$ and $\sigma(\bar{x}) = \bar{y}$. This means that we have some $\tau \in \operatorname{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $\tau(\sigma(m)) = n$. But $\overline{\tau \circ \sigma} = \bar{\sigma}$, and taking $y' = \tau \circ \sigma(x)$ gives us the second bullet. For the reverse implication, if σ witnesses that $mx \equiv ny'$, then in particular $\bar{\sigma}(\bar{m}) = \bar{n}$, so by definition $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{x} = \bar{\sigma}(\bar{x}) = \overline{\sigma(x)} = \bar{y'} = \bar{y}$. The proof that the third bullet is equivalent to the first is analogous. □(claim)

It follows that for any $A \subseteq X/{\equiv_L}$ we have $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{x} \in A$ if and only if $\models (\exists y)\ \bar{y} \in A \wedge \Phi(n, x, y)$ (because "$\bar{y} \in A$" is a $\equiv_L$-invariant condition), which is a type-definable condition about n and x, if A is closed. This gives us the third point from Definition 4.1 (continuity of $(\bar{n}, \bar{x}) \mapsto \bar{n} \cdot \bar{x}$).

To obtain the fourth point (continuity of $\bar{x} \mapsto (\bar{x}, \bar{n} \cdot \bar{x})$ for all $\bar{n}$), note that if we fix any $\bar{n} \in \mathrm{Gal}(T)$ and some $A \subseteq (X \times X)/({\equiv_L} \times {\equiv_L})$, then likewise $(\bar{x}, \bar{n} \cdot \bar{x}) \in A$ exactly when $\models (\exists y)\ (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in A \wedge \Phi(n, x, y)$, which is again a type-definable condition about x whenever A is closed.

Similarly, for the sixth point (closedness of $(\bar{n}, \bar{x}) \mapsto (\bar{x}, \bar{n} \cdot \bar{x})$), note that $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is in the image of $A \subseteq ([m]_{\equiv} \times X)/(\equiv_L \times \equiv_L)$ exactly when $\models (\exists n)\ (\bar{n}, \bar{x}) \in A \wedge \Phi(n, x, y)$, which is a type-definable condition about x and y, as long as A is closed.

The remaining parts of Definition 4.1 are easy to verify. □

Proposition 7.2. *Suppose E is a bounded invariant equivalence relation on an invariant set X. Suppose also that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ contains $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C})$ [and suppose $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$]. Write $\bar{\Gamma} := \Gamma/\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C})$ [and $\bar{\tilde{X}} := \tilde{X}/{\equiv_L}$]. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) $E = E_\Gamma$ [$E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}}$]
(2) $\bar{E} = E_{\bar{\Gamma}}$ [$\bar{E} = R_{\bar{\Gamma},\bar{\tilde{X}}}$]

In particular, E is [weakly] orbital if and only if $\bar{E}$ is (because we can always assume that $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C})$ is contained in the group witnessing [weak] orbitality, as $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C})$ fixes each class setwise).

Proof. In this proof, for brevity, whenever $x \in X$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, we will write $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ as shorthands for $[x]_{\equiv_L} \in X/{\equiv_L}$ and $\sigma \cdot \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C}) \in \mathrm{Gal}(T)$, respectively.

Consider the quotient map $q\colon X \to X/{\equiv_L}$. Then we have:

$$q[\Gamma \cdot x] = \bar{\Gamma} \cdot \bar{x}, \tag{$\dagger$}$$

and, since $\Gamma \cdot x$ is an $\equiv_L$-invariant set, conversely:

$$\Gamma \cdot x = q^{-1}[\bar{\Gamma} \cdot \bar{x}]. \tag{$\dagger\dagger$}$$

For the orbital case, the implication (1)⇒(2) is an immediate consequence of ($\dagger$) – $\bar{E}$-classes are the q-images of E-classes, while $\bar{\Gamma}$-orbits are the q-images of Γ-orbits. The converse is analogous, as by ($\dagger\dagger$), Γ-orbits are the q-preimages of $\bar{\Gamma}$-orbits and of course E-classes are q-preimages of $\bar{E}$-classes.

The weakly orbital case can be proved similarly: by Lemma 3.22, we can assume that

$$\tilde{X} = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot \tilde{X}, \tag{$*$}$$

Then we can just apply Lemma 3.20: if

$$[\bar{x}]_{\bar{E}} = \bigcup_{\bar{\sigma}} \bar{\sigma}^{-1}[\bar{\Gamma} \cdot \bar{\sigma}(\bar{x})]$$

(where the union runs over $\bar{\sigma}$ such that $\bar{\sigma}(\bar{x}) \in \bar{\tilde{X}}$), then also

$$[x]_E = q^{-1}[[\bar{x}]_{\bar{E}}] = \bigcup_{\bar{\sigma}} q^{-1}[\bar{\sigma}^{-1}[\bar{\Gamma} \cdot \bar{\sigma}(\bar{x})]] = \bigcup_{\sigma} \sigma^{-1}[\Gamma \cdot \sigma(x)],$$

where the last union runs over σ such that $\sigma(x) \in \tilde{X}$. To see the last equality, just note that (by ($*$)) $\sigma(x) \in \tilde{X}$ if and only if $\bar{\sigma}(\bar{x}) \in \bar{\tilde{X}}$. This yields (2)⇒(1), and the opposite implication is analogous. □

Corollary 7.3. *[Weak] orbitality of a bounded invariant equivalence relation is a model-theoretic property, i.e. it does not depend on the choice of the monster model.*

Proof. $X/\equiv_L$, $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$, $\bar{E}$ and the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ on $X/\equiv_L$ do not depend on the monster model, so the result is immediate from Proposition 7.2. □

(See also Question 8.6.)

Lemma 7.4. *If $E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}}$ is bounded invariant and either:*

- *for each $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$, $[\tilde{x}]_E$ is type-definable, or*
- $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}}{}_{KP}(\mathfrak{C}) \leq \Gamma$

then $\tilde{X}' := \{x \in X \mid \exists \tilde{x} \in \tilde{X} \;\; x \equiv_{KP} \tilde{x}\}$ satisfies $E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}'}$. (Note that if $\tilde{X}$ is type-definable, so is $\tilde{X}'$, and $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}}{}_L(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot \tilde{X}' = \tilde{X}'$.)

Proof. By Lemma 3.22, the first bullet implies that we can assume the second one: each $[\tilde{x}]_E$ is $\equiv_L$-invariant, so if it is type-definable, it is also $\equiv_{KP}$-invariant (see Fact 2.10(1)), i.e. $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}}{}_{KP}(\mathfrak{C})$-invariant.

Now, assuming the second bullet: the $\tilde{X}'$ considered here contains $\tilde{X}$ and it is contained in the maximal one defined as in Lemma 3.22 (because the maximal one is Γ-invariant, and hence $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}}{}_{KP}(\mathfrak{C})$-invariant), so $E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}'}$. □

7.2. **Results in the case of automorphism group action.**

Theorem 7.5 (Meta-theorem 1 for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$)**.** *Suppose E is a bounded invariant, orbital equivalence relation on X. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) E is type-definable,
(2) each E-class is type-definable,
(3) Γ_E is the preimage of a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$*,*
(4) $E = E_\Gamma$ for some Γ which is the preimage of a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$*,*
(5) X/E is Hausdorff.

Proof. (1) and (5) are equivalent by Fact 2.10(6).

The rest follows readily from Theorem 4.4, Lemma 7.1 and Proposition 7.2. For example, if $E = E_\Gamma$ for some Γ which is the preimage of a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$, then $\bar{\Gamma}$ is closed and by Proposition 7.2, $\bar{E} = E_{\bar{\Gamma}}$, so (by Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 7.1) $\bar{E}$ is closed, and hence E is type-definable. □

Recall that an invariant equivalence relation E is "weakly orbital by type-definable" if there is a type-definable $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$ and any $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}}$.

Theorem 7.6 (Meta-theorem 2 for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$)**.** *Suppose E is bounded invariant, weakly orbital equivalence relation on X. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *E is type-definable,*
2. *each E-class is type-definable and E is weakly orbital by type-definable,*
3. *$E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}}$ for some type-definable $\tilde{X}$ and a group $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ which is the preimage of a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$,*
4. *for every $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ and $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$, if Γ or $\tilde{X}$ is a* maximal *witness for weak orbitality of E, then it is also the preimage of a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(T)$ (in the case of Γ) or type-definable (in the case of $\tilde{X}$),*
5. *X/E is Hausdorff.*

Proof. Points (1) and (5) are equivalent by Fact 2.10(6).

As for the rest, the only added difficulty compared to Theorem 7.5 comes from the fact that the type-definable $\tilde{X}$ we have by the assumptions of (2) and (3) may not be $\equiv_L$-invariant, but thanks to Lemma 7.4, we can assume that without loss of generality. Once we have that, we finish as before, using Theorem 4.7, Lemma 7.1 and Proposition 7.2.

For example, if we have (3), then – by Lemma 7.4 – we can assume without loss of generality that $\tilde{X} = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{f}L}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot \tilde{X}$. This implies that $\bar{\tilde{X}} = \tilde{X}/{\equiv_L}$ is closed. Moreover, $E = R_{\Gamma,\tilde{X}}$, so by Proposition 7.2, we also have $\bar{E} = R_{\bar{\Gamma},\bar{\tilde{X}}}$, so by Lemma 7.1 and Theorem 4.7, $\bar{E}$ is closed, which immediately gives us (1). □

Corollary 7.7 (Meta-corollary for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$)**.** *Assume that the theory is countable. Suppose that E is a bounded, invariant, countably supported equivalence relation on X. Assume in addition that E is orbital or weakly orbital by type-definable. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *E is type-definable,*
2. *each E-class is type-definable,*
3. *E is smooth,*
4. *X/E is Hausdorff,*
5. *for each complete $\emptyset$-type $p \vdash X$, the restriction $E{\restriction}_{p(\mathfrak{C})}$ is type-definable.*

Proof. Clearly, (1) implies (5), which implies (2).

By Theorem 7.5 or 7.6, (2) implies (1).

(1) implies (3) by Fact 2.14, and it is equivalent to (4) by Fact 2.10(6).

Finally, (3) implies that each restriction $E{\restriction}_{p(\mathfrak{C})}$ is smooth, which – by Fact 2.16 – implies (5). □

Note that every orbital equivalence relation is also weakly orbital by type-definable, so the "orbital or" part is redundant.

Remark 7.8. Note also that, in the context of Corollary 7.7, Fact 2.16 implies that if $Y \subseteq X$ is a type-definable and E-invariant subset of X such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot Y = X$ and $E{\restriction}Y$ is smooth, then the condition (5) from the corollary is satisfied.

Moreover, if $X = p(\mathfrak{C})$, then it is a single $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ orbit, so by Proposition 3.27, it is weakly orbital by type-definable (as singletons are certainly type-definable). This gives us an extension of Fact 2.16. (Note that we use this fact in the proof of Corollary 7.7, so it does not give us any alternative proof.)

8. Further questions

Here we present some further problems to consider.

8.1. **Natural definitions.** The Definitions 3.15 and 4.1 are somewhat technical, especially the latter one. One could imagine that there are some replacements for them which would be easier to understand or more general, and still useful.

Question 8.1. *Are the definitions of a weakly orbital equivalence relation and of an agreeable group action "correct", in the sense that there are no more natural definitions which are sufficient to obtain the main results in all the interesting cases?*

One idea to obtain such a "more natural definition" would be to demand that $\tilde{X}$ in Definition 3.15 have the property that it intersects every G-orbit at exactly one point, but there are two problems with this idea.

The first problem is that this alternative definition would be less general, as shown by Example 3.33 – but one could imagine that it is sufficiently general anyway. The second, bigger problem is that we want $\tilde{X}$ to be well-behaved, for example closed in the case of compact group actions, but even if we only consider actions of compact groups on compact spaces, it may be that there is no set $\tilde{X}$ which is closed and intersects each G-orbit at exactly one point: for example, it is impossible for the natural action of $\{I, -I\} \leq \mathrm{SO}(2)$ on the planar unit disk.

8.2. **Other examples.** As another question, one might wonder if there are any more cases where the results of Section 4 can be applied.

Question 8.2. *Are there any other interesting examples of agreeable group actions?*

8.3. **Hausdorff quotients.** In almost all the main theorems we had an equivalent condition about the quotient space being Hausdorff. The only exception (in the applications) was Theorem 5.7, where it seems like the quotient should be Hausdorff as well, but the proof seems elusive. Hence the question.

Question 8.3. *If G is a compact group acting continuously on a Hausdorff space X and E is a closed and weakly orbital equivalence relation on X, then is X/E Hausdorff? (Note that if X/E is Hausdorff, then E is closed, even in purely topological context.)*

Note that we already do know that, at least in case when X is Polish, E is smooth, so the quotient X/E is not very far from being Hausdorff in some sense. Further, we can give a positive answer to the question under some additional assumptions.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose X has the property that for each $x \in X$, there is a closed set $A \subseteq X$ such that $A \cap (G \cdot x) = \{x\}$, but $G \cdot A = X$. Then if E is weakly orbital and closed, then the quotient X/E is Hausdorff.*

Proof. Choose any $x_1, x_2 \in X$. To show that X/E is Hausdorff, we need to find some E-invariant sets F_1 and F_2 which are closed, and such that $F_1 \cup F_2 = X$ and $x_i \notin F_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

If $G \cdot x_1 \neq G \cdot x_2$, then we can even have those F_1 and F_2 be G-invariant (because X/G is Hausdorff by Fact 2.1), so we can assume that $G \cdot x_1 = G \cdot x_2$. Let A be a set as in the assumption of this proposition for $x = x_1$, and let $H = \mathrm{Stab}_G\{[x]_E\}$, and choose some $g \in G$ such that $gx_1 = x_2$.

Then $gH \neq H$ and G/H is Hausdorff, so we can find some closed, H-invariant sets F_1' and F_2' in G such that $F_1' \cap H = F_2' \cap gH = \emptyset$ and $F_1' \cup F_2' = G$.

Now, consider $F_1'' = F_1' \cdot A$ and $F_2'' = F_2' \cdot A$. Clearly, $F_1'' \cup F_2'' = G \cdot A = X$. Moreover, F_1'' and F_2'' are closed (because multiplication $G \times X \to X$ is a closed mapping, by Fact 2.1), and it is easy to see that $x_i \notin F_i''$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Furthermore, because – by Proposition 3.27 – $E{\restriction}_{G \cdot x_1} = R_{H,\{x_1\}}$ and F_1', F_2' were H-invariant, the sets $F_i'' \cap G \cdot x_1$ are E-invariant for $i = 1, 2$.

Consider now $F_i = \{x \in X \mid (\exists y \in F_i'')\ x\ E\ y\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Note that each F_i is the projection onto X of $E \cap (X \times F_i'') \subseteq E_G \subseteq X^2$. By an argument analogous to the one in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we deduce that the F_i are closed (as they are the projections onto X of $E \cap (X \times F_i'') \subseteq E_G \subseteq X^2$), E-invariant sets, and they clearly satisfy the other conditions as well. □

(Note that if X/G has a closed transversal, i.e. closed set in X intersecting each G-orbit at exactly one point, the assumptions of Proposition 8.3 are satisfied.)

8.4. **Ties to descriptive set theory.** In Corollaries 5.8, 6.5, and 7.7, we have tied information about the witnesses of weak orbitality of an equivalence relation to its descriptive-set-theoretic property: smoothness. One might wonder whether this can be used further.

Question 8.5. *Can we extract any additional set-theoretical or topological information about an invariant equivalence relation E from the witnesses to its weak orbitality?*

8.5. **(Weak) orbitality of unbounded equivalence relations.** In Corollary 7.3, we have deduced that being orbital or weakly orbital equivalence relation is well-defined for a bounded invariant equivalence relation. On the other hand, it is not very hard to come up with instances of equivalence relations which are unbounded, but are still orbital or weakly orbital, regardless of the monster model we consider (the simplest example is just equality). Thus, one might wonder whether (weak) orbitality is, in general, a well-defined model-theoretic property or not.

Question 8.6. *Can* unbounded *invariant equivalence relation be "accidentally" [weakly] orbital? In other words, are there monster models $\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2$ and an (unbounded) invariant equivalence relation E such that $E(\mathfrak{C}_1)$ is [weakly] orbital, while $E(\mathfrak{C}_2)$ is not?*

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Krzysztof Krupiński, for his support and helpful feedback.

References

[BK96] Howard Becker and Alexander Sotirios Kechris. *The Descriptive Set Theory of Polish Group Actions*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. ISBN: 0521576059 (cit. on p. 5).

[Bou66] Nicolas Bourbaki. *General Topology, Part 1*. Elements of Mathematics. Paris and Reading, Mass.: Hermann and Addison-Wesley, 1966. ISBN: 978-1-124-08341-4 (cit. on p. 5).

[Bre72] Glen Eugene Bredon. *Introduction to compact transformation groups*. Pure and applied mathematics. New York: Academic Press, 1972. ISBN: 978-0-08-087359-6 (cit. on p. 4).

[CLPZ01] Enrique Casanovas, Daniel Lascar, Anand Pillay and Martin Ziegler. 'Galois Groups of First Order Theories'. In: *J. Math. Log.* 1.2 (2001), 305–319 (cit. on pp. 6, 8).

[KM14] Itay Kaplan and Benjamin Miller. 'An embedding theorem of $\mathbb{E}_0$ with model theoretic applications'. In: *J. Math. Log.* 14.2 (2014), 1450010 (22 pages). DOI: 10.1142/S021906131450010X (cit. on pp. 7, 8).

[KMS14] Itay Kaplan, Benjamin Miller and Pierre Simon. 'The Borel cardinality of Lascar strong types'. In: *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 90.2 (2014), 609–630. DOI: 10.1112/jlms/jdu041 (cit. on pp. 7, 8).

[KPR15] Krzysztof Krupiński, Anand Pillay and Tomasz Rzepecki. 'Topological dynamics and the complexity of strong types'. In: (1st Oct. 2015). arXiv:1510.00340 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 7–9).

[KPS13] Krzysztof Krupiński, Anand Pillay and Sławomir Solecki. 'Borel equivalence relations and Lascar strong types'. In: *J. Math. Log.* 13.2 (Dec. 2013). DOI: 10.1142/S0219061313500086 (cit. on pp. 7, 8).

[KR14] Krzysztof Krupiński and Tomasz Rzepecki. *Smoothness of bounded invariant equivalence relations*. (Accepted in J. Symb. Log.) 2014. arXiv:1406.7402 (cit. on pp. 3, 7, 8, 26).

[Mil77] Douglas E. Miller. 'On the measurability of orbits in Borel actions'. In: 63.1 (1977), pp. 165–170. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9939-1977-0440519-8 (cit. on p. 5).

[TZ12] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. *A course in model theory*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. ISBN: 9780521763240 (cit. on p. 6).

E-mail address: tomasz.rzepecki@math.uni.wroc.pl

Instytut Matematyczny, Uniwersytet Wrocławski, pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland